

REMARKS

Claims 1-70 are pending.

Claims 1, 5, 6, 8-18, 22, 23, 25-35, 39, 40, 42-51, 55, 56 and 58-70 stand rejected.

Claims 2-4, 7, 19-21, 24, 36-38, 41, 52-54 and 57 are objected to, but have been rewritten to include base claim limitations.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication of allowability of claims 2-4, 7, 19-21, 24, 36-38, 41, 52-54 and 57.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 5, 6, 8-18, 22, 23, 25-35, 39, 40, 42-51, 55, 56 and 58-70 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0138481 to Aggarwal et al (hereinafter "*Aggarwal*"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Aggarwal relates to searching product catalogs. More specifically *Aggarwal* teaches that:

Searching online catalog databases by shoppers is improved by performing similarity searching on searches performed by the shopper, in conjunction with adjusting the similarity metric used during the search to interactively improve the relevance of the resulting search results to the shopper. ... This approach is in contrast with attempts to enhance search results using, for example, the shopper's past orders or previous actions, or the past orders or previous actions of other shoppers who may have a purchase history similar to that of the current shopper. *Aggarwal*, abstract.

Aggarwal further states that:

More particularly, the inventive concept involves using similarity searches for querying product catalogs, and relevance feedback techniques and product specification modification to learn the shopper's requirements iteratively and interactivity rather than expecting her, for example, to explicitly identify and weight product various attributes which may or may not be of particular interest. *Aggarwal*, para. 0015.

Figure 3 of *Aggarwal* teaches redefining a query point to provide similarity searching. For example, *Aggarwal* teaches that:

There are cases when the shopper does not know the exact product specification but is looking for a product similar to a particular product that the shopper specifies to the system. ... The system uses the category of the products in which the shopper is interested and extracts the corresponding features from the image of the product if one was submitted by the shopper. Once the query point is determined, the goal of the system is to search for points in the feature space that are near this query point. *Aggarwal*, para. 0059 and 0063 describing Figure 3.

Thus, *Aggarwal* teaches redefining a query in order to search in additional areas of the catalog. In contrast to the present, *Aggarwal* does not teach or suggest “a plurality of rule sets, each of the rule sets specifying constraints that define a scope of the catalog data comprising one of the custom catalogs” as required by claims 1, 18, 35, 51, and 68. *Aggarwal* teaches about queries and redefining queries to perform similarity searching. Such a database search query is not a “rule set [that specifies] constraints that define a scope of the catalog data.” Claims 1, 18, 35, 51, and 68. Claims 1, 18, 35, 51, and 68 each internally distinguish between search results produced by a database query alone and executing a search wherein the scope of the catalog data is also defined by the constraints specified by rule sets by reciting “executing a search ... and returning a set of search results in the form of a subset of the catalog data having the scope defined by the constraints.” *Id.* The search is “performed in accordance with constraints specified by the rule set”; however, the constraints are not alone a query as taught by *Aggarwal*. *Id.* *Aggarwal* is devoid of any teachings of rule set constraints that “define a scope of the catalog data.” Thus, the “subset of the catalog data” is not simply a function of the search (query) but also is a function of the “scope [of the catalog data] defined by the constraints” of the rule sets. Applicants respectfully submit that *Aggarwal*’s teachings regarding redefining a query neither teach nor suggest the “rule sets specifying constraints that define a scope of the catalog data” as required by claims 1, 18, 35, 51, and 68.

Applicants respectfully submit that claims dependent (directly or indirectly) upon independent claims 1, 18, 35, 51, and 68 are allowable for at least the same reasons as the independent claim upon which each depends.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned.

I hereby certify that this is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to:
Mail Stop Fee Amendment, COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS,
P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on July 12, 2004.


Attorney for Applicant(s)

7-12-2004
Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,



Kent B. Chambers
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 38,839